

TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW ATTORNEYS

8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024
Bus: (713) 468-8880
Fax: (713) 468-8883

Fax

To:	Examiner Christian Chace	From:	Fred G. Pruner, Jr.
Company:	U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	Date:	December 17, 2002
Fax:	703-746-7238	Pages:	5
Serial No.:	09/419,523	Our Re:	MCT.O102US

☐ Urgent ☐ For Review ☐ Please Comment ☐ Please Reply ☒ Confirm Receipt

MESSAGE:

• Notice: This information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named on this transmittal sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this faxed information is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify the sender by telephone immediately so that arrangements can be made for the retrieval of the original document at no cost to you.

Official



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant:	Paul Peterson	§	Art Unit:	2187
Serial No.:	09/419,523	§		
Filed:	October 18, 1999	§	Examiner:	Christian Chace
Title:	Determining Memory Upgrade Options	§	Docket No.	MCT.0102US (MUEI-0521.00/US)

Box AP
Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION DATED OCTOBER 28, 2002

Dear Sir:

In an Office Action mailed on October 28, 2002, claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 11-13, 16-22, 25, 28, 29, 31-33 and 36-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai and Yoshizawa claims 3, 14, 15, 23, 34 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai, Yoshizawa and Helm; claims 4 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai, Yoshizawa and Cowell; and claims 6, 7, 10, 26, 27 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai, Yoshizawa and Dresser. These rejections are discussed in the corresponding sections below.

Rejections of Claims 1-11:

The method of claim 1 includes determining memory upgrade options to expand the number of memory devices based on a residual memory capacity of the computer system.

In contrast to the limitations of claim 1, neither Arai nor Yoshizawa teaches or suggests determining memory upgrade options to expand the number of memory devices based on a residual memory capacity of a computer system. In this manner, Arai neither teaches nor suggests determining memory upgrade options, but rather, Arai is directed to allowing a user to

Date of Deposit: December 17, 2002
I certify that this document and authorization to charge deposit account
is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark
Office (Fax No. 703/746-7238) on the date indicated above.
Debra Cutrona
Debra Cutrona